***Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Ed. Alexandra Aikhenvald. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018**

Evidence and evidentiality in Quechua narrative discourse

Rosaleen Howard, Newcastle University, UK

Introduction

This chapter will review ways in which evidentiality operates in the context of narrative performance in Quechua, with particular focus on a variety of the language spoken in the central highlands of Peru.[1] I shall demonstrate that, in Quechua oral narratives, going by the corpus under study here, the grammatical marking of source and status of knowledge, and discursive ways of expressing evidence for knowing what is known, can vary strikingly according to factors related to the situation of performance. Who the narrator is, where they live, what social and kinship networks they are part of, and the social preoccupations uppermost in their minds at the time, can have a profound influence on the way a story is told. On the one hand, narrators base discursively expressed evidence for knowledge, and the veracity and authenticity of the stories they tell, on lived experience – including seeing, and being in, the landscape, and hearsay. On the other hand, in Huamalíes Quechua the assertion of knowledge and affirmation of validity are grammatically marked through use of evidentials, markers of epistemic modality, and certain tenses that embed evidential extension (Aikhenvald 2004: 14). Performative considerations have an effect on discursively expressed evidence, as also on grammatical choices around evidentiality. Taken together, these two dimensions constitute the epistemological underpinning of stories about the past in Huamalíes Quechua, and both will be taken into account in the mixed methods approach to the analysis of the narratives that follows.[2]

My method is also based on the premise that knowledge is emergent in the storytelling event, not necessarily given at the start, and evidentials and epistemic modality markers

[1] Fieldwork was conducted in the district of Tantamayo, Huamalíes province, Huánuco department during the early 1980s and again since the year 2000. Visits to Huamalíes were curtailed during the period of Peru´s internal armed conflict between 1984 and the late 1990s. Huamalíes Quechua relates to the Quechua I dialect grouping named ´Huaylas-Conchucos´ by Alfredo Torero (Torero 2002).

[2] For anthropological analysis of Tantamayo oral tradition see Howard-Malverde (1989, 1990, 1994). It is worth noting that the differentiation between sources of information as grammatically marked by evidentials is also made in semantic distinctions at the level of lexicon, between ways of acquiring knowledge: knowledge: through seeing in waking life, feeling, hearing, dreaming and seeing in visions (Howard 2002a).

are a key grammatical resource for signalling the emergence of each storyline. As Hill and Irvine (1993) put it in their discussion of how evidence, and responsibility for evidence, are expressed and marked in oral discourse: '"Knowledge" is (…) a social phenomenon, an aspect of the social relations between people' (Hill and Irvine 1993: 17). And so it is with the knowledge generated in the storytelling performances in which I played the part of interlocutor during the time I spent in the Tantamayo valley.

As Hill and Irvine observe in the introduction to their 1993 volume, some aspects of linguistic form have interactional processes embedded in them (see also Hanks 2012; Nuckolls and Michael 2012). Among these are aspects to be attended to in this chapter, such as: evidentiality, epistemic modality, deixis, and reported speech. These may be drawn together within the single analytical framework of dialogicality. Indeed, a prominent feature of the oral narratives recorded in Huamalíes is their dialogicality, where polyvocality is key. Following Bahktin, and as we shall show in relation to the Huamalíes corpus, in such narrative there is no 'strictly individual voice' (Hill and Irvine 1993:2). For example, in the story of the black lake (to be analysed below), it's not just the narrator making the argument; other voices intervene, through which the narrator seeks to reinforce the authority and authenticity of her own.

To work with the idea of 'evidence' helps us focus on interaction, for the very premise of evidencing implies an interlocutor (Hill and Irvine 1993: 4). These authors sum up the interest of working on 'evidence', from a linguistic anthropological point of view as follows:

'To focus on "evidence" takes the traditional anthropological interest in culturally situated knowledge and casts it in the framework of social action, exploring how claims to knowledge (or ignorance) are made, and how such claims might be used. Attention to evidence shows clearly that culturally situated knowledge is not a matter of clearly differentiated states, of "knowing" or "not knowing", but is complex in its dimensions, and highly variable in the range of potential dimensions which may be relevant in interaction' (Hill and Irvine 1993: 4).

We can add, furthermore, that the complexity of degrees of knowing is not only expressed discursively, as the majority of the contributors to Hill and Irvine (1993) show, but also grammatically, through the mechanisms we have specified above. Inspired by Hill and Irvine's (1993) approach and by the emphasis lain on evidentiality as a social interactive

phenomenon in Nuckolls and Michael (2012), and building on the linguistic anthropological method developed in Howard (2012), this paper will further demonstrate the mutually entailing relationship between social interactional process and linguistic form that emerges in narrative events, where Huamalíes Quechua narrators recount the past histories and experiences proper to their shared cultural heritage. On the one hand, 'interactional processes [shape] the allocation of responsibility for authorship of a message' (Hill and Irvine 1993: 4); on the other hand, these processes are revealed in grammar, through evidentiality, epistemic modality marking, deixis, and reported speech.

When considered as a systemic feature of language, the core meaning of evidentiality is taken as the grammatical marking of source of information (Aikhenvald 2004: 5), and the Quechua language has been cited as being one of a number of languages of the world in which evidential marking is obligatory (Aikhenvald 2014: 5, citing Weber 1986). However, as our knowledge grows, it becomes clear that there is variability in the way evidentiality works across the Quechua family.[3] When viewed from a pragmatic rather than a systemic perspective, as narrative performances demand, it will be shown that it is far from the case in Huamalíes Quechua discourse that every utterance must obligatorily carry evidential marking. I shall also draw attention to the ways in which evidentiality intersects with other grammatical categories such as epistemic modality and tense, and I shall go beyond a study of evidentials as a circumscribed system for marking source of information, in order to include evidential strategies such as use of reported speech.

Evidentiality, epistemic modality and tense in Huamalíes Quechua

The system of evidential and related epistemic enclitics operating in Tantamayo Quechua is summarised in Table 1. Building on Howard (2012) and previous work by Nuckolls (2008, 2012) I use personal versus non-personal speaker perspective as a framework to define the relative functions of these enclitics and interpret their distribution within a given stretch of discourse. Personal versus non-personal speaker perspective is a phenomenological framework to be understood in terms of Benveniste´s notion of subjectivity in language (Benveniste 1966: 225-266). Personal speaker perspective pertains in a mode of discourse characterised by marks of deixis and other indices of the

[3] To judge by the work of Daniel Hintz and Diane Hintz (2014) on neighbouring Conchucos Quechua, and building on Howard-Malverde (1988) and Howard (2012), the evidential system of the central Quechua languages is more complex than the work of Floyd on Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1994) had previously shown.

speaker´s presence in the utterance (for example, 1st person and 2nd person inflections in the verb); in Huamalíes Quechua the evidential suffix *-mi* is typical of personal speaker perspective. Non-personal speaker perspective contains no grammaticalised indication of speaker subjectivity in the utterance; the evidential suffix *-shi* is a marker of non-personal speaker perspective.

TABLE 1. Evidential and epistemic modal enclitics in Huamalíes Quechua

	personal speaker perspective	*non-personal speaker perspective*	*speaker perspective non salient*
(i) Personal knowledge (EV.PERS); (ii) Affirmative validation (VALID.AFF)	-mi		
Non-personal knowledge (EV.NPERS);		-shi	
Negative assertion (NEG)			-su
Co-constructed knowledge; affirmation (EV.CO-CONSTR.KNOWL.AFF)	-chaa		
Co-constructed knowledge; negation (EV.CO-CONSTR.KNOWL.NEG)	-taaku		
Conjectural (CONJ)	-chir		
Speculative (SPEC)	-suraa		

Table 2 summarises the verb suffixes that mark past tense in Huamalíes Quechua.

Table 2. Past tense markers in the Huamalíes Quechua verb

	personal speaker perspective	*non-personal speaker perspective*	*speaker perspective non salient*
Unmarked tense			Ø
Present perfect (PRS.PRF)	-shqa- / -sh		
Past perfect (PST.PRF)	-shqa ka- / -sh ka-		
Reportive past (REP.PST)		-naa[1]	
Mirative aspect (TA.MIR)	-naa[2]		
Preterite (PRT.PST)	-rqa-		
Habitual past (HAB.PST)	-q ka-		

The tense suffix -*naa*[1] is characteristic of narratives telling of past events that owe nothing to the speaker´s own experience; in using this tense the speaker takes no responsibility for the knowledge imparted and indicates no personal investment in the veracity of the facts. However, as my analysis will show, Huamalíes Quechua narrative discourse may not always adhere to non-personal speaker perspective, even when the story content ostensively relates to events beyond the speaker´s own experience; tense and evidential usage is indicative of this. In our interpretation, use of the perfect (-*shqa*- sometimes shortened to -*sh*) and past perfect (-*shqa kashqa*) tenses mark a closer cognitive association on the part of the speaker with the events recounted than does the reportive past (-*naa*[1]). This closer cognitive association is triggered by context related factors of the situation of performance. The past habitual (-*q ka*-) tense is only used where personal speaker perspective is entailed. The past preterite -*rqa*- tense is only used where personal experience or witness is involved; in this respect this tense can be said to embed evidential extension. Our examples will show how -*rqa*- may contrast in the same stretch of discourse with - *naa*[1], the latter marking an event to which speaker was not witness and for which they cannot take responsibility, the former indicating personal witness as source of evidence. Evidentiality and tense are correlated systems in Huamalíes Quechua. For example, -n*aa*[1] frequently correlates with –*shi* as a means to constitute non-personal speaker perspective, while -*rqa*- frequently correlates with -*mi*, entailing personal speaker perspective.

The nature of the narratives

Residents of several peasant communities (*comunidades campesinas*) within the administrative district of Tantamayo related the narratives to me. In terms of genre, some of these narratives would classify as 'myth' in the social anthropological sense: a story that explains origins and, in its repeated telling through face to face transmission before new generations of family and community members, offers a rationale for a current state of affairs and a guide to action in the future.[4] Other narratives are, again in outsider cultural terms, a blend of legend and history, in which the identity of the protagonists and their deeds can be traced to historical events and personages, while the story is interlaced

[4] In Malinowski's classic definition, ´myth is a charter for society.' However, in the Huamalíes corpus, storytellers may shape the substance of shared oral traditions in order to advance their own view of the world, altering the standard form of a story to fit with their circumstances; it can thus also be said that 'society is a charter for myth' (Howard-Malverde 1986).

with happenings that would be considered to belong to a supernatural order of reality. For example, a cacique of the colonial period traceable to an historical figure in the archive, in the orally transmitted story, as the result of local political conflict, turns into a condor, flies to a nearby mountainside, and turns into stone (Howard-Malverde 1986; 1990; 1999).

Tantamayo Quechua narrators make a distinction between what might be termed 'myth' and what might be classed as 'legend'. However, the terminology they use derives from the Spanish, suggesting that generic classification comes from external influence, even though the terms are used in a distinctly Quechua way. Where a story unfolds in a generic time and space, with no use of toponyms that might anchor the narrated events to the local landscape, this is referred to as a 'kwintu' (from *cuento* 'tale'). A *kwintu* is considered no less true for all that, but most typically the evidential marking of a *kwintu* indicates non-personal speaker perspective. The narrated events are beyond the narrator's personal life experience, and were not witnessed by the speaker. In contrast, narratives in which the action takes place on local territory, identifiable by toponyms, and in which, typically, the narrative protagonists trace paths over the landscape as the story unfolds, are referred to as *leyenda* ('legend') (Howard-Malverde 1989: 56-58; 1990: 36-40).

However, a feature of many of the narratives is the insertion of a narrator's personal point of view into the ´mythic-legendary-historical´ storyline. Indicators of the narrator´s personal investment in the story's content at the cognitive level range in elaborateness from comparing features of content with aspects of the narrator's own life, to detailed explanations as to how the narrator learned the story and the relevance it has for his or her family history, to wholesale reinterpretations of a shared tradition in order for the story to fit with a narrator's individual agenda. As shall be seen, narratives differ in evidential marking and tense usage, due to differing degrees of personal investment in the story told, and the nature of the cognitive associations that the story content holds for the narrator. Indeed, the analysis of evidentiality and the discursive expression of evidence in the stories, leads me to suggest that the concept of genre is not so useful for analytical purposes. Other less categorical ways of viewing the nature of narrative discourse will be proposed, in relation to the excerpts from the stories to which I now turn my attention.

Evidentiality and evidence in the Huamalíes Quechua narratives

I have selected for analysis narrative extracts that exemplify a range of speaker perspectives – from non-personal to personal – brought to bear upon the narrated events, and how speaker perspective is constituted in the use of evidentials and tense-aspect marking. Concomitantly, a more prominent personal perspective on the story may trigger more elaborated discursive assertions of evidence and responsibility for evidence.

Extracts 1 and 2 come from the 'Achkay' cycle, widely told stories about an anthropophagous mythic ancestress who lived in ancient times before the world came to be as it is today (referred to as *unay* 'long ago' or *qullana* 'remote' time).[5] I identified two versions of the Achkay story in the Tantamayo valley. While both are deemed to belong to remote time, they differ from each other in terms of storyline and in terms of the spatial setting in which events occur. One version ('Achkay I') unfolds in a generic Andean space (a home, a rock, a potato field) with no specific place names that might pin the events to a known place. The conditions that gave rise to the story are described as a time of famine. I recorded variants of Achkay I with seven storytellers, all of them women. By contrast, the events of the second version ('Achkay II') take place on community terrain; the trajectory followed by Achkay over the local landscape is plotted by use of toponyms. In the performances of Achkay II, a dialogic relationship evolves between narrative and topography: as the storyline unfolds, so too the community territory is mapped out in the narrator's mind's eye. Variants of Achkay II were recorded from five storytellers, three of them men. Extract 1 provides the first 12 lines of one of the standard variants of Achkay I.[6]

Extract 1. Achkay I, Variant 1, AIE

1 Unay-shi ambruuna ka-naa.

They say in the olden days there was a famine.

2 Unay muchuy ka-naa hwiyupa.

In the olden days there was a terrible famine.

---

[5] The figure known as Achkay can be traced to records of the early colonial extirpation of idolatries in the Andes (Duviols 1986: 119, 120; Arriaga 1968: 232). She features in modern day oral traditions particularly, but not exclusively, of the central Peruvian Andes (Jiménez Borja 1937; Mejía Xesspe 1952; Ortiz Rescanière 1973; Weber and Meier 2008).

[6] For reasons of space, I analyse the grammatical features of the extracts that are relevant to my discussion, rather than providing a full interlinear analysis. The initials indicate narrators´ identities.

3 Say-shi warmi ishkay wawayuq ka-naa warmi ullquta.

Then they say there was a woman with two children, a boy and a girl.

4 Saypitaqa wambrakuna punuykaptin sakay huk masurka harata tariykurqa ankakuyaananpa kallanata ashi-naa.

Then while the children were asleep at night, finding a cob of corn (the parents) looked for the pan in order to grill it.

5 Saypita wambrakunaqa wiyaskir "Maychuuraa kallana churaraykan?" niptinqa "Ulla kuchuchuuchaa mamay chullallaykan kallanaqa" niptin "Aa punuykashchir" nirqa "Riyaykaaya-sh kashqa aw, say wambrakunata apay shikraman wiñarkur machayman warkaykamuy" ni-naa papaaninta.

Then when the children heard them saying "Where is the grill pan?" and replied "The gwill pan has been put down there in the corner, mummy,"[7] (the mother) said to their father saying "those children aren't asleep at all, they are wide awake; throw them into a basket, take them away and hang them in a cave".

6 Intuns papaaninqa shikraman wiñarkurqa apa-sh kash warkuq machayman.

Then their father throwing them into a basket took them to hang them in a cave.

7 Intuns machaychuu ishkan wambrakunaq warkaraykaayaa-naa.

Then the two children were dangling in the cave.

9 Warkaraykaayaptinqa paasaski-naa allqay.

As they were dangling there a *dominico* bird happened by.

10 Allqay paasaskiptinqa wambrakuna qayaku-naa "Tiyuy allqay hipiykallaamay!" nir.

When the *dominico* bird came by the children called out saying "Uncle *dominico* get us out of here!"

11 Nir qayakuptinqa muna-naa-su allqayqa.

When they called out, the *dominico* bird didn't want to.

12 "Imapaataa 'aqish baaraq' nima-rqa-yki?" nir paasaku-naa.

---

[7] In the performance the children's speech is imitated by a phonetic shift from [r] to [ly] in the words *ulla* (*ura* 'down below') and *chullallaykan* (*churaraykan*, 'is placed, put'); in the English translation, the word *gwill* ('grill') is an attempt to reproduce this imitation of childish pronunciation.

"Why did you call me 'worm measurer?'" saying, he passed on by.

(…)

(Howard-Malverde 1984: 15-34)

In Variant 1 of Achkay I, the finite verb in 124 of the total 131 utterances, is in the reportive past tense -*naa*[1].[8] In Extract 1, this can be seen in every utterance with the exception of utterance 6 where the past perfect -*sh kash* occurs. -*Naa*[1] correlates systematically with the non-personal knowledge evidential -*shi*. In Extract 1, -*shi* occurs sporadically in the opening utterances; however, once the story is underway -*shi* does not recur with regularity; the sustained use of –*naa*[1] is sufficient to mark the non-personal speaker perspective of the narrator towards the events narrated. This pattern is evidence that, once the epistemological stance of a stretch of discourse is established, source of knowledge markers are not obligatory on every utterance in Huamalíes Quechua. When this speaker perspective changes, -*shi* may be reintroduced or -*mi* used as an alternative.

In the Achkay Version I narratives, the narrated events are marked by correlative use of –*naa*[1] and –*shi* and the narrator adopts a non-personal speaker perspective. Where there is a shift to a personal speaker perspective, typically in the embedded reported speech of the narrated protagonists, there is a shift away from the –*naa*[1]/–*shi* framework, and other past tenses or the unmarked tense take over.

Lines 1-11 of Extract 1 are a classic example of the way the –*shi*/-*naa*[1] combination sets up a non-personal speaker perspective at the start of a *kwintu* such as Achkay I. Each of these utterances carries –*naa*[1] on the finite verb; the -*shi* evidential occurs correlatively in utterances 1 and 3 but is thereafter dropped, -*naa*[1] is sufficient to sustain the non-personal perspective that characterises the story.

The story is also characterised by reported speech, which operates as a driving mechanism, in combination with switch reference, as a means to propel the action along. See how this works in sentence 5, where a number of utterances on the part of the children and their parents flip back and forth between the two sets of protagonists, until the outcome, when the mother tells the father to put the children in a basket and take them to hang them in a cave. The switch references stake out the distinction between the

[8] For present purposes I define an utterance as a sentence, at the level of the narrative storyline, with a single finite verb. Some utterances are simple, such as utterance 1 of Extract 1; others contain complex levels of verbal subordination and embedded reported speech, as in utterance 5.

protagonists' voices; explicit reference to the alternating speakers' identities is not necessary. Note the shift in utterance 12 from the non-personal perspective of the narrator's voice, to the personal speaker perspective of the voice of the *dominico* bird. Correspondingly, person marking (1st person object *-ma-*, 2nd person subject *-yki*) correlates with preterite tense *-rqa-* in the verb form *ni-ma-rqa-yki* ('you said to me').

The Achkay II story brings the protagonist onto local terrain. According to this account there were once two Achkays, a mother and daughter, who lived on Yaqa Willka, the mountain that dominates the valley at the point where the Tantamayo River flows into the Upper Marañón. The mountain is an impenetrable wall of rock rising on the far side of the river, looming over the hamlet of Huancarán and the community of Pariarca – places where the storytellers had their homes. Achkay II tells how one of the Achkay figures crossed over onto community land at the place called Numyaq, some thousand metres below Huancarán on the banks of the river. She encounters a man ploughing a field and, under pretext of lending him a hand in his work, reaches under his clothing, plucks off a testicle and eats it. The ploughman takes flight up the mountainside towards the village with Achkay in hot pursuit. As she goes she loses sight of him due to the sharp incline. As she passes a series of landmarks, she calls out for directions to the Achkay who had remained behind on the top of the mountain and can see the lie of the land.

The narrative becomes a dramatized dialogue as the Achkay figures call back and forth to each other, the reported speech acting as a mechanism to move the story along and at the same time trace the path of the protagonists over the landscape. Through the litany of place names that thus emerges, we learn the toponymy and topography of the stretch of land reaching from the river's edge up to the place called Runa Hirka, located above the village of Pariarca. At Runa Hirka, according to most variants, Achkay meets her end, tricked by the villagers into falling into a cauldron of boiling water. The variant of Achkay II narrated by EGB of Pariarca is typical, in that it uses the present perfect *-shqa-* for the storyline, sometimes varying with the Ø tense. The reportive past *-naa*[1] is never used. The evidential *-shi* combines with *-shqa-*, attributing something of an 'in between' epistemological status to the narrated events. *-Shi* indicates that the narrator does not take personal responsibility for their veracity; yet the unfolding of the action in the known space brings it cognitively closer, making *-shqa-* the more appropriate tense.

The contrast in tense and evidential use between Version I and Version II of the Achkay story is striking. With regard to tense, although the narrative sustains a non-personal speaker perspective, the siting of past action on local territory is described by use of the perfect (-*shqa*-) and pluperfect (-*shqa kashqa*) tenses (more common when personal speaker perspective is in play), not the reportive past *naa*[1] as in the Achkay I stories. My argument is that where narrative action is tied to local topography, the cognitive associations that this triggers in the narrator´s mind invites use of tenses that evoke an approximation of the action to the here and now of the performance situation, even though the narrated events are ostensibly of the past and outwith the speaker´s personal experience. Further evidence of this will be given in relation to other narratives.

Extract 2 is taken from a section of the pursuit sequence in Achkay II, in which we see how -*shi* no longer appears, but -*mi* (and its allomorph -*m*) unfailingly marks the direct speech of the narrated protagonists, both in the interrogative mood utterances (when Achkay calls out 'Which way now?') and in the indicative mood utterances (when the daughter Achkay, looking out over the land, calls back 'This way, that way!'). Their personal speaker perspectives are marked in this way.

Extract 2. Achkay II, EGB

1 (…) Numyaq hananman charkurqa "Martina! Maytana-m maytana-m tuiy?" ni-sh.

(…) arriving up above Numyaq she called "Martina! Which way, which way now?"

2 Niptinqa "Saki Warawyamanna-mi hiqarkun" ni-shqa.

When she said that, "He's going up by Saki Warawya now," she said.

3 Sayman charkurpis yapay "Martina! Maytana-m maytana-m tuiy?" ni-sh.

Arriving up there she called again "Martina! Which way, which way now?"

4 Niptinqa "Pullan kwistana-mi hiqarkun" ni-sh.

When she said that, "Now he's climbing half way up the hill," she said

5 Sayman pullan kwistamanpis charkurqa yapaypis qayaku-sh Martinaman ari.

And arriving halfway up the hill, again she called out to Martina.

6 Saynuu qayakuraykar cha-shqa "Martina! Maytana-m maytana-m tuiy!"

She arrived calling out like that, "Martina! Which way which way now?"

7 Niptinqa “Saki Warawyatana-mi” ni-sh.

When she said that “By Saki Warawya now” she said.

(…)

(Howard-Malverde 1989: 27-28)

Extract 2 provides a typical example of how the citative verb *niy* (‘to say’) acts as a hinge mechanism that connects one citative phrase to the next, pushing the narrative action along in dialogue form. The finite verb form *nishqa/nish* (‘she has said’) comes at the end of each stretch of speech, followed by the switch reference form with anaphoric function *niptinqa* (‘when she said that’) that introduces the next utterance. Indeed, reported speech as a mechanism for driving the story along is prominent in both versions of the Achkay story. In Achkay I we have the interaction between children, birds, and animals during two escape sequences (one of which is exemplified in Extract 1). In Achkay II we have the interaction between the two Achkays as they look over the landscape. In both cases the action becomes a dramatized dialogue in which the narrator’s voice embeds the voices of the narrated protagonists.

The salience of the spatial framing of narrative events in oral performance has to be appreciated in relation to the performance situation: sitting out in the open air, in people’s yards or doorways, looking out over the vast mountainous landscape, where pathways crisscross between communities, and where, in the days when I recorded these stories, roads had barely intruded into the countryside beyond the district capital. As elsewhere in the Andes, distinctive features of the landscape are named, and the landscape constitutes an animate cosmos in the way described by Allen for southern Peru (Allen 2015). The relationship between landscape, ritual, mythic belief and storytelling is a deep one across Andean societies in their history, tied to an agro pastoral way of life that becomes disrupted by the road building that brings more regular access to urban centres. Indeed, when I last visited Tantamayo in 2009 people remarked on how these stories are rarely told any more.

One variant of the Achkay II story powerfully illustrates the influence that the cognitive associations triggered by the ever-present physical landscape can have on the evidence base of the storytelling event. The narrator of this variant is physically located in the place called Huancarán, directly opposite the mountain from where the sentinel Achkay looks

out and calls the names of the places the second Achkay passes in pursuit of her victim. Whereas the other variants of Achkay II trace the path of the mythical ancestress to the place called Runa Hirka, directly above the community of Pariarca, in PLL´s variant, once the Achkay has reached a point on the territory beyond which she herself is less familiar, her narration comes to an end. Quite literally, from Huancarán where she lives, she cannot see beyond this point due to the contours of the land; in telling the story she cannot visualise how the sentinel Achkay would have been able to see any further, in order to guide the pursuing Achkay on her way. The different toponyms mentioned by PLL, compared with those that occur in other variants, map out the terrain with which she is most familiar, and she claims not to know the story after a certain point because of the hill that blocks the way: *mana fiixuta sayta musyaasu* (´I don´t know that part very well´) (Howard-Malverde 1989: 61). With her example, we see the emergent nature of knowledge in the story telling event. The visibility of landscape is needed to keep the story going; it is also a support for memory; not seeing the lie of the land means not knowing the story; a dialogical relationship is revealed between storytelling and landscape, the one discursively producing the other (Howard 2002b: 46).

Landscape, emergence of knowledge, and evidential usage

The intrinsic relationship between landscape, the storyteller´s bodily presence in it, the cognitive associations it triggers, the emergence of knowledge in performance, and the status of that knowledge, has repercussions for the use of tense and evidentials. In this section I shall demonstrate how this is so by analysing tense and evidential usage in another Tantamayo story cycle, which tells of a rebellious cacique of colonial times. I was told six variants of the story of Fernando Ambray, one of which differs from the others in important ways. The standard variant narrated by EML begins as follows:

Extract 3. The legend of Fernando Ambray, standard variant, EML

1 Pariashchuu marka ka-naa.

There was a town at Pariash.

2 Pariarca kaq ka-naa-raasu marka.

Pariarca was not yet a town.

3 Saychuu, Pariashchuu, *cada veintecuatro de junio fiesta patronal* ka-q.

There in Pariash, every twenty-fourth of June it used to be the festival for the patron saint.

4 Sayman shamu-q Chavínpita curaqa.

The priest used to come there from Chavín.

5 Chavínchuuqa unaypita marka ka-q.

There used to be a town at Chavín since the olden days.

(…)

(Howard-Malverde 1990: 6-7)

The narrator begins by setting the scene in a lengthy passage made up of 9 utterances, the first five of which are presented in Extract 3. We note how the reportive tense *-naa*[1] marks the first two utterances, which describe a state of affairs in a distant past in which the narrator did not participate. From utterance 3 onwards, still in the scene-setting phase of his story, he shifts to the 3p singular habitual past *-q* (*ka-q* 'it used to be', *shamu-q* 'he used to come'). At utterance 10 he shifts back to use of *-naa*[1] as he begins to recount the particular events of the story, as in Extract 4:

Extract 4. The legend of Fernando Ambray, standard variant, EML

(…)

10 I imanuupaaraa, na mayanqa say kwintuqa curaqa tardaamu-naa.

And however it was, the story goes that the priest was late.

11 Mulata muntakur unay mulallawan puri-q montash curaqa.

Riding on a mule, in the old days the priest used to travel just on muleback.

12 Saypitaqa kachayash kanqa kutimu-naa-su.

Then the person they had sent to fetch him didn't return.

13 I procession horaqa día hunaqqa Pariashchuu chaamu-naa-su curaqa.

And on the day and at the hour for the procession the priest did not arrive in Pariash.

(…)

(Howard-Malverde 1990: 6-7)

From this point on, and for the remaining 45 utterances that make up the narrative, he marks every narrated event with –*naa*[1], while using the unmarked present tense when breaking out of narrative mode to comment. The story tells how, when the priest did not arrive to give mass, the cacique took things into his own hands and led the religious procession around the village square. From the other side of the valley, the priest looked down, and pronounced an act of excommunication upon the cacique. The latter escaped on horseback, eventually to turn into a condor and fly across to the mountain Yaqa Willka where he turned into stone. The storyline is interwoven with metanarrative comments on the part of the narrator, which serve to affirm the veracity of the story. These comments are based on the fact that material evidence of the cacique's passage over community lands can be seen to this day: the lithomorphosed figures of the horse, saddle bags, and trunk, and the condor-shaped stone visible on the distant mountainside, are lasting testimony to the story's truth. It is striking that throughout this variant the narrator never uses the non-personal evidential -*shi*, and very rarely uses -*mi*. The alternation between the non-personal reportive past -*naa*[1] with tenses that imply personal speaker perspective (habitual past, and a rare instance of the preterite in the closing passage) would seem sufficient to sustain the difference between non-personal knowledge and personal knowledge or opinion based on visible evidence. Evidential suffixes marking source of knowledge do not feature in this particular narrator's usage, indication enough that these are not systematic or obligatory in Huamalíes Quechua narrative discourse. Extract 5 further illustrates the contrast between narrative storyline and metanarrative comment:

Extract 5. The legend of Fernando Ambray, standard variant EML

1 Say petakilla forma-mi rumi qaqa kan say Ambraypa hawanchuu.

That rock in the form of a trunk is there, just below (the form of) Ambray.

2 Say-mi shikwaski-naa.

It fell to the ground there.

3 I kikin wak simpaman aywa-naa, say qaqaman hamaq.

And he himself went over to the other side of the valley and came to rest on a rock.

(Howard-Malverde 1990:10)

These lines show a transition from metanarrative back to the narrative proper. In line 1 the metanarrative observation about the stone in the shape of a trunk is marked with the personal evidential *-mi*. The trunk-shaped stone is visible on the landscape to this day; the narrator asserts its shape based on his own observation. When he reverts to the story proper in line 2, repeating the detail about how the trunk had fallen from Ambray's horse to the ground where it turned to stone, the speaker carries over the *-mi* personal affirmation but then reverts to the narrative mode in the verb. This gives rise to an anomalous co-occurrence in that line of the personal speaker perspective evidential *-mi* with the reportive past *-naa*[1] of non-personal speaker perspective. By line 3 the transition is complete; the narrator is fully back in narrative mode with the *-naa*[1] tense and his usual lack of evidential marking.

Extract 6 provides the opening lines of a non-standard variant of the story of Fernando Ambray in which the narrator (EGB) diverges in a radical way from the standard variant discussed above.

Extract 6. The legend of Fernando Ambray, non-standard variant, EGB

1 Qallarimushaa parlarna aa.

I'll begin speaking now.

2 Fernando Ambray cacique L____ kwintunta kanan-mi yapay willapaashayki qunqashqaykipita.

I'll tell you the story of Fernando Ambray cacique L_____ again, as you have forgotten it.

3 Primero ka-shqa estabilidaaninqa Apu Raqaa-mi.

His first place of residence has been Apu Raqaa.

4 Qanyantin tomaykaa… fotografía tomaykaamu-shqa-yki.

The other day you have been taking photos over there.

5 Saychuu-mi ta-shqa Fernando Ambray cacique L____ .

Fernando Ambray cacique L____ has lived in that place.

6 Saypita-mi say inkakuna shamur conquistata rurar "Huk marka Lima chikata palaciota rurashun" nir kay Pariarcapa shamur kachamu-shqa enviadonta Felipeta.

Then the Incas coming to conquer "Let's build a town like a little Lima and a palace" saying, and coming here to Pariarca they have sent their envoy Felipe here.

7 Felipillo niya-shqa-mi sayta hutin.

They have called him Felipillo.

(…)

(Howard-Malverde 1990: 10-11)

The distinctive feature of EGB´s storyline is that the cacique´s lifetime spanned both the Inca conquest and the Spanish invasion, and the cacique is represented as having been resistant to both outside forces.[9] A further difference between EGB's version and the others is that here the narrator tells the story entirely in the present perfect tense, evoking personal speaker perspective. In addition, his use of the centripetal directional suffix *-mu-* on verbs of movement, has the effect of bringing the action closer not only in temporal but also in spatial terms. The function of *-mu-* is highly deictic. It situates the action in relation to the speaker; it is a bodily point of reference; its use operationalizes knowledge in relation to the place of enunciation. Use of *-mu-* in narrative discourse is triggered by knowledge of the place and envisaging the narrative action 'in the mind's eye.' The verb phrase *kacha-mu-shqa* '(he) has sent here' (Extract 6, line 6) illustrates this.

EGB's version of the cacique Ambray legend provides fine examples of the operation of speaker perspective in narrative discourse about past events. In this polyvocal text, speaker perspective shifts with the insertion of the narrated protagonists' voices into the warp of the narrator's narrating voice. While the non-personal perspective evidential *-shi* marks the narrated events recounted by the speaker in the narrative event, the personal perspective evidential *-mi* marks the narrated events described by the narrated protagonists, in so far as, from their speaker perspective, they are speaking from personal experience. Variation in tense usage also correlates with the alternations in speaker perspective, as Extract 7 illustrates.

Here, the narrator describes the Inca's route over local terrain in pursuit of the rebellious cacique. The route relates to sites on local territory to which the narrator's community holds title, with which he is personally familiar.

[9] Fuller detail can be found in Howard-Malverde (1990, 1999).

Extract 8. The legend of Fernando Ambray, non-standard version, EGB

1 Entonces saychuupis kan-mi raqaanin inkapa.

So there too is a ruined house belonging to the Inca.

2 Say Qipa Cara punta kaylaanin hunaqna-mi, say Qipa Cara puntachuuna-mi kachariya-sh kashqa ornamentonkunata inkakuna.

There above Qipa Cara, up over now in this direction on the ridge above Qipa Cara, the Incas had left behind their ornaments.

3 Say castillochuu tari-sh ka-shqa.

In that castle (someone) had found (them).

4 Kay postreroraa-chaa *veintenueve de junio*chuu-shi tari-naa.

In these recent times on the 29th of June someone found them, so they say.

5 Huk primoo-mi ka-rqa-n, Pablo M____ V____ hutin ka-rqa-n primoopa, aha.

He was a cousin of mine, Pablo M____ V____ was my cousin's name.

6 Say-mi willama-rqa-n saytaqa "Tari-rqa-a inkapa ornamentonta i nuqaqa 'Pita negociantekuna-chir kaychuuqa hamapaykan' ni-rqa-a-mi sayta rikachakushqaayaq tikraskikunaapaa mana ka-naa-su say ornamentokuna".

Then he told me that: "I found the Inka's ornaments and then saying to myself, 'What travelling merchant must be taking a rest around here?' while I was taking a look around, by the time I turned back the ornaments weren't there any more."

7 "Maharaa-naa" nir willapaama-rqa.

'They were spread out on the ground', saying he told me.

8 Saytana-mi nuqa yarparaykaa.

I am just remembering it now.

9 Saychuu sayraa-shi lindo ornamentokunaqa.

The beautiful ornaments were still there, so they say.

10 Saynuu-chaa willama-rqa-n sayta.

That is the way he told it me.

11 Sayna-mi pasa-shqa Qipa Carapa.

So then they have passed through Qipa Cara.

(Howard-Malverde 1990: 21-22)

In lines 1-3 we find a combination of the personal speaker perspective evidential *-mi* with the past perfect tense, typical of this narrator's way of describing historical events unseen by himself that occurred on local sites. This singular use of *-mi* is, I believe, a reflection of EGB's sense of authority as President of the Community Council (*Cabildo*) and recognised community spokesperson at the time of his story performance.

At line 4 the narrator moves to a more recent time frame, to talk about how buried Inka treasure had once been found by a local person on a village feast day. His shift in perspective is signalled first by use of the co-constructed knowledge evidential *-chaa*, whereby he engages the interest of the interlocutor. He then marks the main verb with the reportive past *-naa*[1] and reinforces the non-personal speaker perspective (non-personal knowledge) by use of the *-shi* evidential.

In lines 5-7 the narrator recounts what his cousin P___ had told him about finding the Inka's ornaments on the ground, looking around to see who they might belong to, and on turning back finding that they had disappeared.[10] In bringing his cousin into the story at line 5 he uses *-mi* in combination with *-rqa-* thus fully establishing personal speaker perspective based on direct experience. The *-mi*/*-rqa-* combination persists in the narrative utterance of line 6 when he introduces his cousin's voice, allowing P___ as narrated protagonist to recount what happened to him from his personal speaker perspective. The main verbs in the reported speech utterances are correspondingly in the preterite *-rqa-* (which embeds personal experience evidential extension). He switches from *-rqa-* to *-naa*[2] to report on how he found the ornaments had disappeared (*mana ka-naa-su* 'they weren't there any more' and *maha-raa-naa* 'they had been spread out on the ground'). We classify *-naa*[2] as mirative aspect in so far as it marks states of affairs that come unexpectedly to the speaker's consciousness.

As long as EGB is reporting on this event based on what his cousin told him, he uses the *-shi* evidential for utterances describing the historical facts (as in line 9). When he reverts

[10] The theme of buried gold from Inka times that tantalizingly eludes the finder in the present day is common in Andean oral tradition.

as in line 11 to telling the story of the Inkas based on the evidence of the landscape, he again uses the personal speaker perspective *-mi* in combination with the present perfect *-shqa-*. The patterning of tense, evidentiality, and reported speech is this extract is telling of the power of the landscape to provide direct witness, over and above testimony derived from the hearsay of human interaction.

Thus, if we compare the standard version of the Ambray story with the non-standard one, we observe a difference in tense and evidential usage that can only be explained in terms of the narrators´ personal identities and their particular perspectives on the story they tell. While in the standard version the narrator consistently uses *-naa*[1] as a means to mark his non-personal involvement with the narrated events, the narrator of the non-standard version, in using *-shqa-*, brings the story cognitively closer to his own life, the life of his community, and the life of his interlocutors. Interestingly, *-naa*[1] is only found in EGB´s version when he relates events in the story the evidence for which lies in hearsay (what his cousin P___ M___ told him, see Extract 7, line 7). As long as he bases his story on his personal knowledge of the landscape, he uses the present perfect tense and the personal speaker perspective evidential *-mi* to talk about past events that unfolded in the ever-present space. Tense and evidential usage in EGB´s version is concomitant with the idiosyncrasy of his storyline; together, these signal a personal interpretation of history for reasons for which there was also extra textual evidence.[11]

Genealogies, evidence and evidentiality

The narrator JLA puts a version of the Achkay story to idiosyncratic personal use, in part by connecting it to the story of the cacique Ambray. She tells the story of the origin of a lake (*Yana Qucha* 'Black Lake') situated on the moorlands above the community where Achkay's activities in Achkay II are located. A female protagonist whom she gradually comes to identify with the Achkay in the course of the story, is responsible for the creation of the lake and the flooding of the village. After this, according to JLA, Achkay brought her own offspring to repopulate the place. At the end of this performance the narrator segues into a variant of Achkay I (normally located in a generic space). Having prepared the ground with her story of Achkay's creation of the lake, she alters the plot in order to contend that Achkay actually lived in the local community and from her offspring descended the lineage of a family with who she was in dispute at the time of the

[11] See Howard-Malverde (1990: 42-44) for fuller details.

storytelling. The narration reveals the process of creation of a belief, the initial denial of the belief by local people (as narrated protagonists), and their gradual acceptance of the truth of the matter. Through this 'storytelling strategy' (Howard-Malverde 1989) the narrator provides a rationale for the family conflict that is part of her life. Extract 8 illustrates how this manipulation of the oral tradition is reflected in features of evidentiality, epistemic modality and tense.

Extract 8. The story of the black lake (*yana qucha*), JLA

1 Qipaasinchuu taya-sh kashqa unay runa, qullana runakuna.

The men of the old days lived at Qipaasin.

2 Intunsis "Maychuuta yana qucha kantaaku, nuqakunachuu yana quchaq maa rikashun, llullakunkichir" nirqa aywayan.

So "Where's this black lake? There's no black lake here. Let's go and see it, maybe you are lying" saying they go (to take a look).

3 Nir aywayananpa "Taqaychuuchir rikamushqaa hana hirka puntapitami rikamushqaa, waklaachuuchaa yana yanash qucha".

As they were going to take a look (he said) "Over there I looked down from the top of the hill, on the other side I saw a black lake".

4 "Nuqakunachuu mana-mi ima yana quchapis ka-shqa-su, llullakunki" nirqa aywayaananpaaqa say Qipaasinchuu taqkuna, Wankaran kaq, arkarpu-naa Wankaran laaduchuu taq runakuna.

"There's been no black lake in our parts, you're lying", saying, the inhabitants of Qipaasin and Huancarán went and took a look down there, the people who live over by Huancarán.

5 Aywayananpaaqa rasun paypa quchaq, mana nunka qucha kashqanchuu yanayash, yanayanash qucha kaykaa-naa.

When they went (to look), right enough her lake… there was a black black lake in a place where a lake had never been before.

6 "Acha achallay! Kayra-chir yana yanash quchaq, kanan imanashunraa kay yanaya yana yakuta.

"How scary! Here maybe there is a black lake, now what will become of us with this black water.

7 Kayqa mikamaashun-chir, ushamaashun-chir, Wankarantapis Qipaasintapis ushamaashun-chir.

Maybe it will eat us, maybe it will put an end to us, maybe it will finish off (we people of) Huancarán and Qipaasin.

8 Say achkay warmipa quchan-chir kayqa.

Maybe this is that *achkay* woman's lake.[12]

9 Say achkay warmi-mi rurama-sh kansi" nir paykuna mansakash saynuupita Wankaranta abandonayaa-naa.

That *achkay* woman has done this to us" saying they were frightened, and in that way they abandoned Huancarán.

10 Qipaasintapis abandonar shakayaamu-naa.

Also abandoning Qipaasin they came over here.

11 Qipaasinpita Wankaranpita taakuq kay Quyashman shayaamu-naa.

They came over here to Quyash to live, from Qipaasin and Huancarán.

12 Quyashman taakuq trasladukayaamu-naa "Say qucha-mi saltamur".

They moved over here to live at Quyash (saying) "That lake is jumping out".

13 "Yana qucha mikamaashun-chir, achkay-mi saychuu kan".

"The black lake may eat us, the *achkay* is there".

14 Intunsis saynuupa say achkay warmi, yana qucha, say yaqa, saychuu taayan.

So that is how the *achkay* woman, the black lake, those bad (people) live there.[13]

15 Saynuupita kay Wankaranchuu say Ambray nir, saychuuqa taaku-sh.

That is how from that time here in Huancarán that so-called Ambray has lived there.

---

[12] My translation assistant rendered *achkay warmi* as 'mujer mala' ('bad woman').
[13] Here the verb reverts to the plural; the narrator shifts her thoughts to the people of Huancarán whom she considers *yaqa* ('bad'; 'asocial').

16 Ambraypa markan say Wankaran ka-sh.

Huancarán was Ambray's village.

17 Intunsis saynuupa-mi say yaqa warmipa, say yaqa achkay warmipa maldisyonnin o pudirnin hwurmaka-shqa say yana quchu saynuu-shi.

So that is how that bad woman's, that bad *achkay* woman's curse or power has formed the black lake, like that.

18 Say kriyinsya-mi kan say yana quchapita.

There is that belief about the black lake.

(Howard-Malverde 1989: 35-43)

In telling the story of the creation of the black lake, and attributing *achkay* characteristics to the female protagonist responsible, the narrator works up a thesis according to which the *achkay* woman gave rise to descendants who became the Ambray family of colonial times, whose progeny ostensibly still exists in the L___ family, with whom she is in dispute. She uses oral tradition to create the narrative conditions that allow her to put forward this thesis (Howard-Malverde 1989; 1994).

At the end of the second part of her narrative she steps out of the story performance discursively to support the validity of the black lake tale, as in Extract 9. It is significant that a code switch from Quechua to Spanish accompanies the break from performance (Gumperz 1982):

Extract 9. The story of the black lake, JLA

Este cuento de achkay, de yana qucha, me ha contado don Quintin Sánchez de acá, lugareño de acá. Nosotros fuimos a Arancay, a Taso Chico, él me acompañó para ir allí, primeramente profesora, el año cuarenta. Entonces aquí en Laguna Blanca en la cabecera había bonito pasto. Ahí hemos pasteado las acémilas. "Aquí es bonito pasto mamita, vamos a pastear acá" me dice don Quintin Sánchez. Entonces nos hemos sentado junto a esa piedra donde él me dice "Esta es la mujer que se ha convertido en piedra. La mujer que pareció acá." Entonces "Imapitata pyidraqtin konbirtish?" le digo, "De qué es?" Entonces me comienza a contar, "Kay kostami kanaa…." Todo todo ese cuento lo que he acabado de contar, él me contó hasta el *achkay*. Ahí mientras que nosotros pasteamos, que comían, el año cuarenta. Don Quintin Sánchez, él me contó.

That story of *achkay* and black lake, don Quintin Sánchez told it to me. He's a native of these parts. We were on a journey to Arancay and Taso Chico. He accompanied me when I went there on my first teaching post in 1940. There at the head of White Lake there was some good pasture. So we put the mules to graze. "Here's some nice pasture ma'am, let's graze the animals," don Quintin Sánchez says to me. So we sit down by that rock and he tells me it's the woman transformed into stone. "Why did she turn into stone?" (*in Quechua*) I ask him, "What was the cause?" So he starts to tell me how it used to be coast hereabouts, the entire story that I have just told, he told me, right up to the *achkay*. While we grazed the mules, in 1940. Don Quintin Sánchez, he told me.

(Howard-Malverde 1989: 44-52)

JLA's telling of the black lake story was understandably contentious, and members of the L___ family who came to hear of it denied its veracity and its authenticity. In my field diary I made the following observation:

'I asked EML to listen to JLA's version. He said he had never heard of it before and suggested JLA had invented it. (…) He found it unconvincing because the narrator had incorrectly placed *Huni Raqra*. In his words, roughly, other tales are obviously authentic because they are associated with certain places that correspond to reality; in this tale the misplacing of *Huni Raqra* and the claim that Achkay came down that way from *Yana Qucha* renders the tale false. *Huni Raqra* is to the left of *Yana Qucha* and doesn't descend from any lake. The gully that comes down from *Yana Qucha* is *Sesa Raqra*. (…)'

(Rosaleen Howard, field diary 9 Sept 1984).

On another occasion I recorded a conversation with EML on the subject, revealing of cultural criteria for judging 'truth' and 'authenticity' in the oral tradition:

Extract 10. EML on the black lake story (Sept 1984)

RH. Y tiene la opinión de que tal vez es un cuento que [JLA] sabe pero que otras personas no?

RH. And you are of the opinion that perhaps this is a story that JLA knows but other people don't?

EML. Así es, ya.

EML. That's right.

RH. Y por qué razón piensa usted eso?

RH. And why do you think that?

EML. Que no he escuchado?

EML. That I haven't heard it?

RH. Sí, por qué piensa usted que es un cuento que otra gente no… que solamente doña J sabe?

RH. Yes, why do you think it is a story that other people… that only JLA knows?

EML. Tengo razón como repito porque yo he preguntado a varias personas, así adultos, y no me han contado.

EML. I am right as I say, because I have asked several people, adults, and they haven't told me the story.

RH. (Addressing listeners-in) Entonces ninguno de ustedes ha oído de este cuento?

RH. So none of you have heard this story?

Other listener: No señora, recién acabo de escuchar más bien.

Other listener: No m'am, this is the first time I have heard it.

EML. *Yana Qucha* solo que se refiere cuando va el Ambray volando, ahí sí, es el último (lugar) que para, para pasar a la banda.

EML. *Yana Qucha* is just referred to when Ambray goes flying, it is the last place he stops before going over to the other side of the river.

RH. Y ella dice que Ambray fue descendiente de Achkay. Usted ha oído eso?

RH. And she says that Ambray was descended from Achkay. Have you heard that?

EML. No creo. Achkay ha sido más antes. El cuento es más antiguo. Ambray se refiere a tiempos coloniales ya, cuando el cura existía. El Ambray es de tiempos coloniales, y Achkay es más primero, más de *qullanan* tiempo. Así es.

EML. I don't think so. Achkay was before that. It is an older story. Ambray is about colonial times, when the priest existed. Ambray is from colonial times, and Achkay was earlier on, in ancient times. That's how it is.

RH. Así que, que ella llegó acá a vivir en Huancarán, no será cierto?

RH. So, it wouldn't be true that she arrived here to live in Huancarán?

EML. No será, porque en Huancarán no ha vivido el Achkay sino abajo. Inclusive de acá bajaba esa persona a cultivar maíz abajo y le siguió el Achkay (*he alludes to Achkay II*). Y se fue y en Runa Hirka muere. Yo creo que más no hay. Y no se sabe en qué sitio ha sucedido el otro cuento de Achkay, cuando convierte la papa, les engaña, no? (*he alludes to Achkay I*) La papa con la piedra, eso no se sabe en qué sitio, sino que es cuento no más. En cambio el otro Achkay ya tiene su sitio donde contarlo.

EML. No it wouldn't, because Achkay didn't live in Huancarán but down below. And that person went down from here to plant corn and the Achkay followed him (*he alludes to Achkay II*). And she went to Runa Hirka and died there. I don't think there is more than that. And it isn't known in what place the other Achkay story happened, when she transforms the potatoes, she deceives them right? (*he alludes to Achkay I*). The potatoes (she transforms) to stones, it isn't known in what place, it is just a story. On the other hand the other Achkay story has its place where it happens.

EML clarifies the facts of the commonly shared traditions around the two versions of the Achkay story. He places this personage in a different time frame to the cacique Ambray and points out the difference in the spatial settings between the two Achkay stories. In Achkay I her stage is an anonymous space (*no se sabe en qué sitio ha sucedido* 'it isn't known in what place [the story] happened'); in Achkay II she comes onto community lands (*ya tiene su sitio donde contarlo* '[the story] has its place where it happens'). Thus, in bringing the Achkay I story onto known land, and into the very village where EML and other family members have their home, JLA transgresses the norms of the tradition; she takes Achkay out of the temporal and spatial framework that is proper to her according to that version; and her argument is a bone of contention among her fellows.

The relationship between the temporal and spatial frameworks of these traditions can be seen to influence the use of tense and evidentiality in the texts. Where narrators make personalised use of the oral tradition to serve a particular agenda, grammatical marking may alter. In the Achkay stories -*naa*[1] is used for events in generic space and -*shqa*- is used when events are locally grounded. In the case of the Ambray tradition, most narrators treat this as a story of bygone times and have no personal investment in it. They use -*naa*[1] on the verbs. EGB however gives the story direct relevance to his life by marking the finite verbs with -*shqa*-. Narrative pragmatics can be held to influence these

grammatical choices. In EGB's version we found evidence to suggest that the testimony of place is stronger even than that of hearsay; it is as if 'places speak truer than people' (Howard-Malverde 1990: 81), bringing to mind the way in which PLL pulled up short in her description of Achkay's trajectory over the land, quite literally 'because of the hill that blocks the view' (Howard-Malverde 1989: 61).

Concluding remarks: narrating lives, transcending genres

Parameters of space, time and personal identity influence evidentiality and tense in Huamalíes Quechua narrative discourse. Variations in the use of these markers have to be seen from the point of view of pragmatics, to be accounted for in terms of the cognitive, psychological, or emotional associations that the story content evokes in the narrator. It is tempting to work with the concept of genre in relation to these stories, to separate out the elements that we would classify as myth, legend, history, and life story, for example. However, analysis shows that these categories do not really apply to Quechua oral narrative, which is to a large extent embedded in conversation (Mannheim and Van Vleet 1998; Allen 2011) and does not respect neatly defined genre conventions.

It is better to look at Quechua narrative as a flow of discourse whose recurrent themes are to do with the relationship between human society and figures of the non-human world. The narrated protagonists of the stories are of diverse ontological status: landscape spirit beings, animals, legendary-historical figures, family ancestors, and living humans. In exploring through verbal discourse the relationships between these different types of being, stories emerge that, from a culturally external analytic perspective, we might classify in terms of genre. However, if we stay with a more flexible view of the narratives as life stories the events of which unfold on different levels of reality, this allows us to be less categorical in terms of story 'type'. Indeed, to impose a categorical framework may obscure the deeper meanings at work within the stories (which express preoccupation with poverty, perceived infrastructural inadequacies in the community, social conflict, and so on). Underpinned by a shared cultural cosmovision at whose heart lies the tense and ambivalent relationship between levels of reality and sources of power (the 'social' and the 'supernatural'), any one story can be found to intertwine in a single narrative performance, events deemed to unfold in the present human world, the past human world, and the non-human worlds that span both past and present. The fluidity of the relationship between the narrated worlds, and the way they mesh in performance

with the world of the narrative event, is constituted from within a range of speaker perspectives in any given story. In turn, these speaker perspectives are both constructed and linguistically signalled through the correlative use of evidentiality, tense, epistemic modality, deixis, and reported speech.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2014. The grammar of knowledge: a cross-linguistic view of evidentials, and the expression of information source. In Alexandra Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *The grammar of knowledge.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 1-51.

Allen, Catherine J. 2011. *Fox boy: intimacy and aesthetics in Andean stories*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Allen, Catherine J. 2015. The whole world is watching: new perspectives on Andean animism. In Tamara L. Bray (ed.) *The Archaeology of Wak´as. Explorations of the Sacred in the Pre-Columbian Andes.* Boulder: University of Colorado Press. Pp. 23-46.

Arriaga, Pablo José de. 1968. *Extirpación de la idolatría del Piru*. In F. Esteva Barba (ed.) Crónicas de interés indígena. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Vol. CCIX.

Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Vol. I. Paris: Gallimard.

Duviols, Pierre. 1986. *Cultura andina y represión. Procesos y visitas de idolatrías y hechicerías Cajatambo, siglo XVII*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas.

Floyd, Rick. 1994. The Wanka reportative as a radial category. In Peter Cole, G. Hermon, and M.D. Martin (eds) *Language in the Andes*. Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Latin American Studies. Pp. 151-189.

Hanks, William F. 2012. Evidentiality in social interaction. *Pragmatics and Society* 3 (2): 169-180.

Hill, Jane and Judith T. Irvine. (eds.). 1993. *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hintz, Daniel and Diane Hintz. 2014. The evidential category of mutual knowledge in Quechua. *Lingua*. (publication details to be completed)

Hintz, Diane. 2007. Past tense forms and their functions in South Conchucos Quechua. Berkeley: UC Berkeley, Pacific Rim Research Program.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1984. *Achkay. Una tradición quechua del alto Marañón*. *Amerindia*, 9, supplément 5, *Chantiers Amerindia*. Paris: Asociación de Etnolingüística Amerindia (A.E.A.). 46 pages.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1986. The achkay, the cacique and the neighbour: oral tradition and talk in San Pedro de Pariarca. *Bulletin de l´Institut Français d´Études Andines* XV (3-4): 1-34.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1988. Talking about the past. Tense and testimonials in Quechua narrative discourse. *Amerindia* 13: 125-155.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1989. Storytelling strategies in Quechua narrative performance. *Journal of Latin American Lore* 15 (1): 3-71.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1990. *The Speaking of History: ´Willapaakushayki´ or Quechua Ways of Telling the Past*. London: University of London Institute of Latin American Studies. Research Papers, no. 21. 101 pages.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1994. "La gente más bien hace guerra con los cuentos": estrategias narrativas en una comunidad quechua del Perú central. In Margot Beyersdorff and Sabine Dedenbach Salazar-Sáenz (eds.) *Andean Oral Traditions: Discourse and Literature/Tradiciones orales andinas: discurso y literatura*. Bonn: Holos. Bonner Amerikanistische Studien (BAS) 24. Pp. 117-135.

Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen. 1999. Pautas teóricas y metodológicas para el estudio de la historia oral andina contemporánea. In Juan Carlos Godenzzi Alegre (ed.) *Tradición oral andina y amazónica. Métodos de análisis e interpretación de textos*. Cuzco: Centro Bartolomé de las Casas. Pp. 339-385.

Howard, Rosaleen. 2002a. *Yachay*: The *Tragedia del fin de Atahuallpa* as evidence of the colonisation of knowledge in the Andes. In Rosaleen Howard and Henry Stobart (eds.) *Knowledge and Learning in the Andes. Ethnographic Perspectives*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. Pp. 17-39.

Howard, Rosaleen. 2002b. Spinning a yarn. Landscape, memory, and discourse structure in Quechua narratives. In Jeffrey Quilter and Gary Urton (eds.) *Narrative Threads. Accounting and Recounting in Andean Khipu*. Austin, TX.: University of Texas Press. Pp. 26-49.

Howard, Rosaleen. 2012. Shifting voices, shifting worlds. Evidentiality, epistemic modality and speaker perspective in Quechua oral narrative. *Pragmatics and Society* 3 (2): 243-269.

Jiménez Borja, Arturo. 1937. *Cuentos peruanos*. Lima: Lumen.

Mannheim, Bruce and Krista Van Vleet. 1998. The dialogics of Southern Quechua narrative. *American Anthropologist* 100 (2): 326-346.

Mejía Xesspe, M.T. 1952. Mitología del norte andino peruano. *América Indígena* XII (3): 235-251.

Nuckolls, Janis and Lev Michael. 2012. Evidentials and evidential strategies in interactional and socio-cultural context. *Pragmatics and Society* 3 (2): 181-188.

Nuckolls, Janis. 2008. Deictic selves and others in Pastaza Quichua evidential usage. *Anthropological Linguistics* 50 (1): 67-89.

Nuckolls, Janis. 2012. From quotative other to quotative self: Evidential usage in Pastaza Quichua. *Pragmatics and Society* 3 (2): 226-242.

Ortiz Rescanière, Alejandro. 1973. *De Adaneva a Inkarrí*. Lima: Retablo de Papel.

Torero, Alfredo. 2002. *Idiomas de los Andes. Lingüística e historia*. Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos/Editorial Horizonte.

Weber, David. 1986. Information perspective, profile, and patterns in Quechua. In Wallace Chafe and Joanna Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality. The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. Pp. 137-155.

Weber, David and Elke Meier (eds). 2008. *Achkay. Mito vigente en el mundo quechua*. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. Serie Lingüística Peruana, no. 54.